1	STATE OF ARIZONA
2	DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
3	
4	
5	* * * *
6	
7	PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE PINAL ACTIVE MANAGEMENT AREA
8	FOR THE FINAL ACTIVE HANAGEMENT AREA  FOR THE FOURTH MANAGEMENT PERIOD, 2010 TO 2020
9	
10	* * * *
11	
12	
13	August 20, 2020
14	Florence, Arizona
15	
16	HEARING OFFICER: JOHN RIGGINS Arizona Department of Water Resources
17	Chief Compliance Officer & Ombudsman
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	Prepared By:
24	Nicola Bauman, CCR Perfecta Reporting Certified Court Reporter 602.421.3602
25	AZ Certificate No. 50830 CRRF No. R1071

Г

1	BE IT REMEMBERED that pursuant to notice a
2	public hearing was held at the Pinal County Board of
3	Supervisors' Hearing Room, 135 North Pinal Street,
4	Florence, County of Pinal, State of Arizona, and via
5	webinar at https://bit.ly/Pinal4MPHearing, before
6	Nicola Bauman (via webinar), AZ Certified Reporter
7	No. 50830 in and for the State of Arizona, on the 20th
8	day of August, 2020, commencing at the hour of 1:03 p.m.
9	
10	* * * *
11	
12	<u>SPEAKER INDEX</u>
13	SPEAKER: PAGE:
14	Jim Goldman18
15	Scott Riggins20
16	Dan Jones28
17	Brian Betcher30
18	David Snider32
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Florence, Arizona 1:03 p.m.

## PROCEEDINGS

MR. RIGGINS: Today is August 20, 2020. The time is approximately 1:03 p.m. We are in the Pinal County Board of Supervisors' Hearing Room located at 135 North Pinal Street, in Florence, Arizona. This is the time and place for the public hearing on the Proposed Management Plan for the Pinal Active Management Area for the fourth management period.

My name is John Riggins. I am the chief
Compliance Officer and Department Ombudsman at the
Arizona Department of Water Resources, and I will be the
hearing officer for today's hearing.

With me is Natalie Mast, Program Manager for Active Management Plans. Natalie has been involved in the development of the Proposed Management Plan and will give a brief description of the Proposed Management Plan, including a summary of comments provided by the Pinal Active Management Area Groundwater Users Advisory Council on the draft management plan, data in support of the Proposed Management Plan, and changes from the third management plan.

Also with me today from the Department are Kelly Brown, Deputy Counsel; Maggie Martin, Management Plans Specialist; Sharon Scantlebury, Docket Supervisor. Einav Henenson, Statewide AMA Director, is participating via webinar.

We have a court reporter present via webinar to record and transcribe what is being said today, so it's important for speakers to please speak up and speak slowly so that the court reporter can accurately record your comments. If anyone has difficulty hearing me or a speaker, please let me know.

For those in person, if you haven't already done so, please sign the sign-in sheet on the table near the entrance. There are also speaker cards on the table. If you'd like to speak today, please fill out a speaker card, if you haven't done so already, and submit your card to Sharon or to Maggie.

For those on the webinar, we have provided a link to a virtual speaker card in the chat box and on the screen. The chat box can be opened by clicking the speech bubble icon at the bottom of your screen. If you'd like to speak via the webinar today, submit your virtual speaker card, and staff will assist you with unmuting when it is your turn to speak. Everyone was muted on entry to the webinar.

For those of you participating via telephone and not on the webinar, we will unmute you. If you'd like to make a verbal comment, please state and spell your name and we will unmute you when it is your turn to speak. If you would like to make a comment, please -- if you would not like to make a comment, please simply stay silent. We will call on the telephone participants to speak after the webinar participants today.

me?

Persons presenting comments at the hearing, whether in person or virtually, will be subject to a three-minute -- we're going to pause briefly.

We've lost our feed into our overflow room, so I will pick up at this portion of our meeting.

(Hearing paused from 1:06 p.m. to 1:10 p.m.)
MR. RIGGINS: Test. Test. Can anybody hear

Okay. So for the sake of everybody on the line, I'm just going to restart at the portion I think that we lost the feed in the other room. So bear with me if you've already heard this portion.

So today we have a court reporter present via webinar to record and transcribe what is being said today, so it is important for speakers to please speak up and speak slowly so that the court reporter can accurately record your comments. If anyone has

difficulty hearing me or a speaker, please let me know.

For those in person, if you haven't already done so, please sign the sign-in sheet on the table near the entrance. There are also speaker cards on the table. If you would like to speak today, please fill out a speaker card, if you haven't done so already, and submit your card to Sharon or Maggie.

For those on the webinar, we have provided a link to the virtual speaker card in the chat box and on the screen. The chat box can be opened by clicking the speech bubble icon at the bottom of your screen. If you'd like to speak via webinar today, submit your virtual speaker card, and staff will assist you with unmuting when it is your turn to speak. Everyone was muted on entry to the webinar.

For those participating via telephone and not on the webinar, we will unmute you. If you'd like to make a verbal comment, please state and spell your name, and we will unmute you when it is your turn to speak. If you would not like to make a comment, please simply stay silent. We will call on the telephone participants to speak after the webinar participants.

Persons presenting comments at the hearing, whether in person or virtually, will be subject to a three-minute time limit to ensure all who wish to speak

receive an opportunity to do so.

The purpose of this hearing is to provide members of the public the opportunity to make oral and written comments on the Proposed Management Plan for the Pinal Active Management Area for the fourth management period. The proposed plan is available on the Department's website, azwater.gov/ama/management-plans.

We will not be responding to questions or comments at this hearing today. However, we will do so in writing as part of the formal management plan adoption process. If anyone has questions -- has any questions or comments on issues or programs that are outside the scope of this hearing, you can contact me or one of our staff after the hearing.

The hearing will be conducted in a formal manner. As I mentioned previously, the court reporter is recording everything that's being said. A copy of the transcript of the hearing will be available for review at the Department's office and will also be posted on the Department's website when it is available.

At the conclusion of this hearing, I'll be accepting any written comments or documentary evidence that anyone may wish to submit to the Department regarding the Proposed Management Plan. The Department will also accept written comments until 5:00 p.m. today.

Written comments, submitted up until 5:00 p.m. today, should be submitted to the Department's Docket

Supervisor, Sharon Scantlebury, by email to -- and I'll spell this -- sscantlebury@azwater.gov or fax at 602-771-8686. A copy of the public notice with Sharon's contact information is posted on the Department's website, and her business cards are located on the table near the entrance if you would like one.

Within 30 days from today, the Director will make and file in the Department a written summary and findings with respect to the comments and evidence received at this hearing and prior to 5:00 p.m. today.

If, in the findings, the Director decides to adopt the management plan, the Director will make and file with the Department an order adopting the plan pursuant to the findings. Notice of the order will be sent to all persons who signed the attendance sheet today and to all persons who submitted comments or evidence prior to the close of the record. Please make sure you provided your physical or email address to receive a copy of the notice.

The Director will also publish a summary of the plan, findings and order of adoption once a week, for two consecutive weeks, in the Casa Grande Dispatch.

Pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes sections 45-571 and

45-114, subsection (C), any person may file a request for rehearing or review of the order of adoption within 30 days after the second publication of the notice. The last day for filing requests for rehearing or review will be identified in both the mailed and published notices of the order of adoption. If no one files a timely request for rehearing or review, the plan will become final.

If a timely request for rehearing or review is filed, the director will have 60 days after receiving the request to issue a decision on the request. The Director may grant a rehearing, grant review without a rehearing or deny the request. Any person may seek judicial review of the Director's decision to adopt the management plan as provided in Arizona Revised Statutes section 45-114, subsection (C).

Within 30 days after the plan becomes final, the Department will mail notice of the conservation requirements contained in the plan to all persons who are required to comply with the requirements. Any aggrieved person may request an administrative review of a conservation requirement within 90 days after receiving notice of the requirement as provided by Arizona -- by Arizona Revised Statute section 45-575, subsection (A).

A person who requires additional time to comply with a new conservation requirement may request a variance within 90 days after receiving notice of the requirement pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes section

I will now turn the hearing over to Natalie Mast, who will describe the proposed plan in greater detail.

Natalie.

45-574, subsection (A).

MS. MAST: Thank you, John.

Good afternoon. My name is Natalie Mast, and I am the Program Manager working on the management plans at ADWR. The purpose of this presentation is to present data in support of the Proposed Management Plan and to provide a summary of the comments made by GUAC members. I will also provide a brief overview of the content of the proposed plan and the changes as compared to the Third Management Plan, if I can get the slide to switch.

Could you go one more slide, please? Thank you.

The initial draft of the Pinal Active
Management Area Fourth Management Plan was published in
March 2020. From March to June, ADWR accepted comments
and worked to revise the plan in response to those

comments. The GUAC comments I will summarize shortly were received in this time period.

In June, ADWR published an updated draft incorporating GUAC member and stakeholder recommendations. On July 14th and 21st, a public notice was published in the Casa Grande Dispatch announcing today's hearing and opening the formal comment period on this plan, which closes today at 5:00 p.m.

ADWR will publish written findings from today's hearing within 30 days, and so long as adoption of the proposed plan occurs within this calendar year, the conservation program in the plan will go into effect on January 1st to 2023.

The recommendations received from GUAC members -- the recommendations received from GUAC members covered a broad range of topics. A full text of those comments was posted on the management plan's page on ADWR's website alongside ADWR's response.

Where comments pointed to errors or data inconsistencies, we worked to verify the information provided to make corrections. Additional style and data recommendations were incorporated in some cases.

The comments received were diverse in nature, but some recurring topics included the Pinal AMA management goal, the historic cropping program, concerns

regarding assured water supply and recommendations for the Fifth Management Plan. The Pinal AMA goal is defined in Arizona Revised Statutes section 45-562, subsection (B), and ADWR has not recommended any changes to the goal at this time. One erroneous mention of "safe-yield" in the initial draft was corrected. The historic cropping program is required to be included in the 4MP pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes section 45-567.02 despite the program having no participants.

Basic background information regarding the assured water supply program is provided in the 4MP. Given the complex and dynamic nature of the ongoing conversations regarding the assured water supply challenges in the Pinal AMA, the best source of information will continue to be the Pinal groundwater supply updates page on ADWR's website.

Comments regarding the Fifth Management Plan and additional recommendations that were not incorporated at this time have been noted and may be considered as a part of ADWR's ongoing Fifth Management Plan's workgroup process.

Next slide, please.

I will now provide a brief overview of some data related to the AMA and the summary of the proposed plan.

Next slide.

The Pinal Active Management Area is one of the four original active management areas established as a part of the 1980 Groundwater Management Act. It includes the Maricopa-Stanfield, Eloy, Aguirre Valley, Santa Rosa Valley and Vekol Valley sub-basins.

This graph shows how groundwater demands have changed over time. The top, dark-blue line is total statewide groundwater use. The middle, green line is total active management area groundwater use. And the bottom, light-blue line is the Pinal AMA groundwater use. In the Pinal AMA, total groundwater use has been fairly flat but has increased slowly over time. Additional increases in groundwater use are anticipated in this AMA.

The graphs on the screen now show how water use is broken down by sector in the Pinal AMA. The different colors represent the sectors: dark blue is agriculture, light blue is municipal, green is industrial and gold is tribal water use estimates.

On the left, you see a comparison of how these break down in different geographies. Statewide, on the far left, about 73 percent is agriculture, including Indian agriculture; and the AMAs, all together, are about 56 percent, and the Pinal AMA is

about 94 percent. AMA ag, or that use that is subject to the AMA conservation requirements, is about 80 percent of the total water demand in the Pinal AMA.

This graph shows the supplies used to meet those demands each year. The Pinal AMA increased its usage of Colorado River water early in the 1990s, but these volumes are expected to decrease. Groundwater use also increased in that time period on the graph, and this is expected to further increase in the future.

In analyzing how those supplies and demands impact the AMA as a whole, we turn to the goal of the AMA, which is to allow development of non-irrigation uses and to preserve existing agricultural economies in the active management area for as long as feasible, consistent with the necessity to preserve future water supplies for non-irrigation uses.

The blue line on this chart shows overdraft in the AMA alongside the colored bars, which show groundwater demands in each sector: orange for municipal, gray for industrial, green for agricultural and pink for tribal demand estimates. There is variation in overdraft over time, but more recent trends show total groundwater demand and overdraft increasing in the Pinal AMA. This overdraft can be expected to increase with anticipated reductions to Colorado River

water availability and corresponding increases in groundwater pumping in the Pinal AMA.

The management plans are one tool that ADWR has to help move each AMA toward its goal. While the Pinal AMA has a unique goal, all of the AMAs have something in common: All of the AMAs can move toward their goal by reducing withdrawals of groundwater. This is precisely what the conservation programs in all of the management plans are designed to do; that's what indicates that these programs should be designed to achieve reductions in withdrawals of groundwater.

The Proposed Management Plan contains eleven chapters, many containing data, analysis and background information. Chapters 4, 5 and 6 also contain the continuing mandatory conservation programs for agricultural, municipal and industrial water users, respectively. These programs are designed to reduce withdrawals of groundwater.

In order to move the Pinal AMA towards its goal, the Fourth Management Plan does include some changes from the Third Management Plan. Some of the changes have to do with data, data quality and the analysis of that data. With additional reporting requirements and some audits to ensure the quality of the data that is being provided, ADWR can better assess

the effectiveness of the conservation programs in the management plans. We want to be transparent about the use of that data, though, and so we will be expanding upon an existing report to publish our analysis of that and other reported data.

The Fourth Management Plan also contains changes to the conservation programs for all three sectors. These changes are intended to be incremental adjustments to increase conservation where we can in the Fourth Management Plan and to begin conversation on bigger changes to be made in the Fifth Management Plan. These Fourth Management Plan changes include a restructuring of the BMP point systems for the agricultural and municipal sectors and higher points targets for these programs, a change in the turf application rate for turf facilities, an adjustment to the highest 25 percent of water duties and several other changes.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the fact that these management plans are very much a team effort, with an enormous amount of work put in by my predecessors, by management plans and active management area staff, by other staff from around the Department, and with significant input from other state agencies, from GUAC members, and from the regulated community. We

would not be here today without the collaborative effort of all of those people and many more. So thank you to all who contributed in any way.

With that, thank you for your time and attention. And I will hand it back over to John, who will be calling a speaker.

MR. RIGGINS: All right. Thank you, Natalie.

So that moves us on to comments. So for those participating via the telephone and not the webinar, we are going to unmute you briefly. If you'd like to make a verbal comment, please state and spell your name, and we will unmute you when it is your turn to speak. If you would not like to make a comment, simply stay silent on the line. We will call on the telephone participants to speak after we do the webinar participants. So we will unmute the telephone participants now.

Is there anyone who would like to speak from the telephone? If so, just provide your name, spell your name, and then we'll call on you after the webinar participants give their comments.

Hearing none, I'll call to the telephone participants again; I think I saw it later on in the script.

And we have a few, though -- there are a few in-person speaker cards. Please be advised that presenting comments at this hearing, whether in person or virtually, will be subject to a three-minute time limit to ensure all who wish to speak receive the opportunity to do so.

So I will now begin calling the names of the persons who filled out speaker cards here in person. If you wish to speak and you have not filled out a speaker card, please fill out one of the cards on the table near the entrance and submit it to Sharon.

When I call your name, please come up to the podium, state your name, identify any person or entity that you represent and then give your comment. After you have commented -- after you've completed your comment, please exit the room so we can rotate additional speakers in from our overflow room.

So the first comment card that I have here is Mr. Jim Goldman.

MR. GOLDMAN: My name is Jim Goldman. I reside at Steele Road, south of Coolidge. Dairy farmer; been there for 30 years.

All around me now are solar reflectors being put in, thousands of acres of it. My question was -- and I think Natalie pretty well answered it -- what's

going to happen 20 years from now whenever those reflectors or simulators are obsolete or are phased out for any reason? What's going to happen to the groundwater rights? Are they going to remain? Are they going to be nullified? What's going to happen?

And the other question I had was, is all of those thousands of acres that's being taken out and put into solar, are they being considered in the plan when you talk about increased use of water in the county? Because those acres are not being irrigated and so, therefore, there's hundreds of acre-feet of water that's not being utilized, so I'm wondering if that's being considered.

That's all my comment was, were these questions. Thank you.

MR. RIGGINS: Thank you. And again, we're not going to be responding directly to questions or comments today at the hearing. However, as part of the formal process, we will respond in writing.

MR. GOLDMAN: But I suggest that just to give you an indication of what's on people's minds. You know, it doesn't -- it probably won't affect me, anyway. I've got irrigation rights established thirty-some years ago, but I just wanted to figure out what's happening.

MR. RIGGINS: Next, we have Ms. Cindy

1 Compton.

No comments?

Okay. Mr. Scott Riggins.

MR. S. RIGGINS: My name is Scott Riggins.

I am a Pinal County farmer, an independent agricultural groundwater pumper and an agricultural landowner for the last 35 years. With three minutes' time, I'm can see I'm going to have to cut some of these things down.

First of all, I also am a member of the GUAC, but I cannot speak to anything that has been recommended by the GUAC, because, indeed, there has been nothing recommended by the GUAC to this process.

Indeed, there is a serious statutory deficit in the management plan at this time.

Ms. Mast made the comment that there is a summary of comments by GUAC members. That doesn't represent activities taken by the GUAC. And, in fact, individual members in a government body with open meeting laws can't speak to what the intent of the organization they represent is.

I'll refer to statute 45-421, Administrative

Duties of Groundwater Users Advisory Councils, and it

states: The Groundwater Users Advisory Council shall

advise the area director for the active management area,

make recommendations on groundwater management programs

1 and policies for the active management area and comment to the area director and to the Director on draft 2 3 management plans for the active management area before they are promulgated by the Director. That subsection 4 is a "shall," that we "shall" do that. 5 This comment that individual GUAC members 6 7 spoke for GUAC is totally negated by subsection 5 of the 8 same statute, and it states that: The Groundwater Users 9 Advisory Council shall manifest and record its actions 10 by motion, resolution or other appropriate means. 11 Pinal GUAC has never had a motion and has never, as a 12 council, made a recommendation to forward this plan, not 13 one time. There have been numerous calls for 14 individuals to make comment. That does not fulfill the 15 statutory obligations. 16 To move on to another issue -- and obviously 17 the Department has tended to think that that's not the 18 They've stated that they can carry their 19 statutory obligation through asking members --20 MS. MAST: Mr. Riggins, I'm afraid your 21 three minutes is up. 22 MR. S. RIGGINS: Pardon me? 23 MS. MAST: I'm afraid your three minutes is 24 up.

MR. S. RIGGINS: I haven't spoken for three

25

```
1
    minutes. I haven't spoken for three minutes. I have
    my --
2
3
                 MS.
                      MAST: I'm afraid your --
                 MR. S. RIGGINS: -- watch right here. I
4
5
    have not spoken for three minutes.
                 MS. MAST: We have a timer as well, and your
6
7
    three minutes is up.
8
                 MR. S. RIGGINS: Is the hearing officer
9
    going to stand for that?
10
                 MR. RIGGINS: As we stated, we're not
11
    responding to any questions or comments.
12
                 MR. S. RIGGINS: I wasn't -- I wasn't asking
13
    a question. I was making a statement. I have not
    spoken for three minutes.
14
15
                 MR. RIGGINS: Sir, we are keeping record of
16
    the time. Ms. Mast says it was three minutes; it's
    three minutes.
17
                 MR. S. RIGGINS: Well, let that be noted.
18
19
                 MR. RIGGINS: If there are any other
20
    questions or comments or issues that you have, you can
21
    submit those in writing --
22
                 MR. S. RIGGINS: By the end of today --
23
                 MR. RIGGINS: -- as a part of this process.
24
                 MR. S. RIGGINS: -- yes. Thank you very
25
    much for your time.
```

```
MR. RIGGINS: You have -- two people from
1
2
    the room have given you their three minutes, so you have
    a total of six additional minutes.
3
                 MR. S. RIGGINS: Thank you very much.
4
5
                 MR. RIGGINS:
                               Okay.
                                  I very much appreciate
6
                 MR. S. RIGGINS:
7
    that.
8
                 MR. RIGGINS: You're welcome. And we are
9
    starting the timer.
10
                 MR. S. RIGGINS: That's fine.
                 MR. RIGGINS: Okay.
11
12
                 MR. S. RIGGINS: Let me check -- okay, very
13
    good. I'm looking at my watch too.
14
                 Ms. Mast, as I was saying, has spoken to the
15
    concept of summaries of GUAC members' comments. Again,
16
    that does not fulfill the statutory obligations of the
17
    council that must act in a manner of having a motion or
    referendum or some issue to make their recommendations
18
19
    and activities valid; never done.
20
                 To move on to a different issue, I would
21
    like to draw attention to the drafted management plan's
22
    Table -- Table 4-1. Table 4-1 is called the Pinal AMA
23
    agricultural water supply and demand 2085 [sic] to 2017.
24
    The last column to the right calls itself the allotment.
25
    The other headings are use and the last heading is
```

allotment. Allotment isn't defined, but it seems like, really, it can be nothing other than the sum of all the base management plan irrigation grandfathered-right water duties. That would be what the allotment, I think, would mean.

This figure of allotment for 2017 shows an allotment for the Pinal AMA agricultural water supply to be 624,366 acre-feet; very good. In the Department's table that goes on the management plan, which is summary number 1, which is a table of all the IGFR allotments, that sum is 898,107 acre-feet. There's an enormous disparity between those two, and obviously one or the other is wrong.

It's interesting that this 898,107 acre-foot allotment on irrigation grandfathered rights is actually over what the total agricultural demand was for 2017. I would certainly like to see this explained, because it creates enormous confusion, and I do believe it also leads to conclusions that are improper.

The GUAC has had various discussions since the beginning of the year that have always been exactly that: They've been listening sessions. They have been agenda-driven by the Department, and the GUAC has not had an opportunity as an entity to comment on what is being said. We have asked many times. We have not had

a meeting dedicated to discussion and formatting and opinion to give as the GUAC.

One issue that has never been discussed and given action by the GUAC is the concept of including, in audits, the concept of crop type to be put down for data collection on an already existing statutory irrigation grandfathered right. That is a huge intrusion of privacy. It has never been discussed. There has never been issue, in any manner whatsoever, taken in a public fashion to comment on this, but it is in the plan at this time.

The last issue that I probably have time for is there have been changes put together on the agricultural BMP program. There was a discussion by the Department to take a 10-point system and convert it to a 12-point system. I don't think that, in and of itself, is a problem. Most of the things done, I believe, are workable; they're not onerous.

However, in farm irrigation systems, category 2, we have taken the irrigation systems that we have prioritized and we have totally changed the point values in such a way that is perfunctory/arbitrary and doesn't reflect, at all, technical or efficiency concepts. In the original BMP, level irrigation systems, low-pressure sprinklers and triple-irrigation

systems were all 3 points. What we have done now is we've taken level systems, we've kept them at 3 points, and taken low-pressure and triple- and given them 25 percent more value. Technically, you might be able to achieve, under best conditions, 5 to 8 percent greater value but nowhere near 25.

To make matters worse, in the existing farm irrigation systems, series of systems, there are -- one, two, three, four, five, six -- seven different types of level systems and non-level irrigation systems that are listed. But under low-pressure sprinklers, even though their efficiency doesn't anywhere justify the 25 percent increase in point value, it doesn't account, in any fashion whatsoever, what the field conditions are underneath the sprinkler system.

A sprinkler system on unlevel ground can be much less efficient than a sprinkler system on level ground. And it can also be much less efficient than a level-basin irrigation system. So we have built into this proposal that a sprinkler system, if it's low-pressure, regardless of the ground it sits on and possibly having much less efficiency than a level-basin system, is going to have 25 percent higher points. There's nothing technically to justify this. It's an arbitrary decision to try to incentivize a different

irrigation system, nothing other than that.

And, in fact, it will, in time, give point values to systems that are less efficient. Indeed, triple-irrigation systems can be very efficient, but they're very, very management intensive. And without the aspects of what needs to be done with those triple-irrigation systems, just like the original BMP points system spread, it doesn't guarantee any enhanced efficiency at all. It seems to me that the Department was seeking an optic here; not true efficiencies, not something that the industry works with, not exactly what happens in the field, but an optic.

And again, the attempted discussions on this have been very difficult to even have with the Department. But they have this here today, and it is in this promulgation. And I would like the issues of the lack of efficiencies and the disparities addressed.

And with that, I think I have almost used up my nine minutes. I thank the hearing officer for the ability to testify.

MR. RIGGINS: Thank you, sir.

Did we have any other cards for in-person?

All right. Let the record reflect that no
one else wishes to speak in person. That will move us
on to our virtual speaker cards, so we will now begin

calling the names of the persons who filled out the virtual speaker cards.

If you are participating via the webinar and wish to speak and have not filled out a virtual speaker card, please submit the form available through the chat feature or at the web address that you see on the slide. I don't believe I will be calling the name, but one of the staff members will be calling your name. They will unmute you. So please state your name, identify any person or entity that you represent and then give your comments. As a reminder, there's a three-minute time limit.

MS. WELSCH: This is Makenna Welsch. I'll be reading the names of the speaker -- the webinar speaker cards. So the first speaker we have is Dan Jones. Dan Jones, you are now unmuted.

MR. JONES: Thank you. My name is

Dan Jones. I'm counsel for Maricopa-Stanfield and San

Carlos Irrigation & Drainage Districts.

The districts, both, have prepared some written comments that either have been submitted or will be submitted shortly, but they both share one kind of overarching concern they've asked me to highlight.

There still seems to be pretty significant confusion, at least between the districts and the Department, as to

what the Pinal AMA management goal actually is.

Overall, based on the Department's framing of the issues and proposals and the stated departure from the prior planned depletion concept, whatever goal ADWR wants to achieve in the Fourth Management Plan looks an awful lot like safe-yield. It's fair enough to use a term other than depletion to describe the goal. There's no doubt that Pinal AMA has some unique water challenges, but we can't lose sight of the fact that there is a statute that sets a particular management goal. That statute has to mean something, and whatever it does mean, it's pretty clear that it's not safe-yield.

This is -- it's really important that we all understand what the goal is. That goal sets the scope of what -- of how DWR is supposed to manage the AMA. And if you don't know what the goal is, we can't really figure out what we're trying to achieve and where we're at in the process.

The Districts appreciate that the Department hasn't really proposed any dramatic changes to the substantive regulatory measures in the draft Fourth Management Plan, but we still contend that it's absolutely critical that the Department and stakeholders get together and actually come to a clear understanding

1 of what the goal is before ADWR adopts any new regulatory measures that are based on the 2 3 re-characterization of the purpose of the goal. That's all I wanted to highlight. We 4 5 appreciate DWR's consideration of the written comments. 6 The districts are happy to answer any questions or 7 provide any other information that might be useful in 8 this process. 9 MS. WELSCH: The next speaker is Brian Betcher. 10 Brian Betcher, you are now unmuted. 11 MR. BETCHER: Can you hear me okay? 12 MS. WELSCH: Yes. 13 MR. BETCHER: Okay. Very good. I want to start out by saying that I'm recently retired from 14 15 Maricopa-Stanfield, so I'm speaking on behalf of myself, as a citizen who is knowledgeable about what goes on in 16 the Pinal AMA. 17 18 I first want to agree with the comments of 19 Scott Riggins, 100 percent, and with those of Dan Jones. 20 I just want to highlight a couple of additional things that I think should be considered. 21 22 The idea of modifying the best management 23 practices in the Fourth Management Plan is very, very

late in the process. And several times along the way,

there were agreements that there would be no changes

24

25

through the conservation programs.

As Scott pointed out, there's enough concern over how that's being done and how points are being weighted that I would recommend that there's no reason why a probably more technical group can't be pulled together to do more collaborative work on those BMPs and wait for the Fifth Management Plan to do it. You're talking about a two-year difference in between, and that is not going to upset the balance of management in the AMA. I highly recommend that.

And with that, as well, I believe there needs to be more work done between the base program and the BMPs. I just know how our farmers have proceeded over the years, and I think the overall effects in the basin is that it does come up to equivalency. There will be more groundwater pumping going forward. But the key question is, without the best management practices program, would there be more pumping than there will be with the program? And I don't know that analysis work has been done.

And with that, I will complete my comment.

MS. WELSCH: Thank you.

And the next speaker is David Snider. David Snider, you are now unmuted.

MR. SNIDER: Thank you. My name is

David Snider. I've been a member of the Pinal AMA's Groundwater Users Advisory Council for some 30 years. I currently serve as chair.

I wish to substantiate Mr. Riggins' comments in that the Department presented draft versions of the Fourth Management Plan at several GUAC meetings. And it is true that members of the GUAC, the council, did, at those meetings, speak to some issues that they had as individuals. However, there was never, ever any motion made or vote taken by the council to make a recommendation to the Director, as per statute, regarding the Fourth Management Plan.

Subsequent to the last meeting of the Pinal AMA's council on May 27th, we were notified that there was a deadline of -- excuse me -- June 4th, I believe. And individual comments from board members -- from council members were solicited, and I believe several council members did; I know I did, and I believe there was another one. Again, however, there has never been a formal action by the Groundwater Users Advisory Council regarding the Fourth Management Plan.

I want to thank the Department. I understand the imperatives that are driving the calendar for this plan. I'm appreciative of the Department's desire to accommodate that imperative. But I also want

```
to make sure that the "Is" are dotted and the "Ts" are
1
2
    crossed.
3
                 Thank you for your time.
                 MS. WELSCH:
4
                               Thank you.
5
                 And I do not see any other speaker cards at
    this time.
6
7
                 MR. RIGGINS: All right. Thank you,
8
    Makenna.
                 So if there's no one else who would like to
9
10
    submit a virtual speaker card, we will let the record
    reflect that no one else on the webinar wishes to speak.
11
12
    So that will move us to our telephone participants.
13
                 Makenna, was there anyone who wanted to
14
    participate via the telephone, or speak?
15
                 MS. WELSCH:
                               So I only see one telephone
    attendee who is not connected to the webinar, so I will
16
17
    unmute that call again to see if they would like to
    leave their name.
18
19
                 MR. RIGGINS:
                                So if you're on the phone and
20
    you'd like to participate, just state your name and then
21
    your comment; if not, you can just simply stay silent
22
    and we will move on.
23
                 Okay.
                        Hearing none from the telephone, I
24
    will call to the overflow room to see if there are any
25
    additional persons who wish to speak.
```

And I see none. Let the record reflect that there's no one in the overflow room who wishes to speak at this time.

As I mentioned earlier, written comments on the Proposed Management Plan may be submitted until

the Proposed Management Plan may be submitted until 5:00 p.m. today. If you'd like to submit written comments after the close of the hearing but no later than 5:00 p.m. today, please fax or email them to Sharon Scantlebury, the Docket Supervisor. Her fax number is 602-771-8686, and her email address is sscantlebury@azwater.gov. Sharon's business cards with her contact information are located on the table near the entrance if you would like one.

This public hearing is now adjourned.

Thank you, all, for attending and providing comment.

(WHEREUPON, the public hearing was adjourned at 1:55 p.m.)

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	I, Nicola Bauman, Certified Court Reporter
7	for the State of Arizona, do hereby certify that the
8	foregoing 34 pages constitute a full, true and accurate
9	transcript of the proceedings had in the foregoing
10	matter, all done to the best of my skill and ability.
11	
12	Dated at Phoenix, Arizona, this 3rd day of
13	September, 2020.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	Nia D. Barra
19	Nicola Bauman, CCR
20	Certified Reporter No. 50830 For the State of Arizona
21	TOT THE State of ATTZONA
22	
23	
24	
25	